

REMARKS

Claims 1-94 are pending.

Claims 1-94 are rejected.

In the office action dated May 14, 2008, claims 1-94 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by a paper entitled "DataJewel: Tightly Integrating Visualization with Temporal Data Mining."

The paper is the applicant's own work and, therefore, is not a proper reference under 35 USC §102(a). Pursuant to MPEP 2132.01, a Rule 132 declaration by the sole inventor, Mihael Ankerst, is attached. The Rule 132 declaration states that the paper is the applicant's own work, and that his co-authors did not contribute to the conception of any of the pending claims. Therefore, the '102(a) rejection of claims 1-94 should be withdrawn.

The office action also indicates that claims 73-94 are rejected under 35 USC 101 as lacking the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or manufacture within the meaning of section 101.

Applicant's attorney Hugh Gortler called Examiner Srirama Channavajjala to determine why the rejection was made and how it could be overcome. Unfortunately, Examiner Channavajjala didn't offer any assistance.

This '101 rejection is addressed by the amendments above to claims 73, 82, 84 and 93. These amended claims now recite means-plus-function language instead of "frame presenter," "identifier" and "representation determiner."

If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to further discuss this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/

Hugh P. Gortler

Reg. No. 33,890

(949) 454-0898

Date: August 13, 2008